

One square, one insertion.	\$1.00
Each subsequent insertion.	.50
Business and Editorial Notices, per line.	.25
One square, one year.	5.00
One column, one year.	25.00
One column, six months.	15.00
One column, three months.	10.00
Half column, one year.	12.50
Half column, six months.	7.50
Half column, three months.	5.00
One-quarter column, one year.	3.12

The space occupied by ten lines of this type (Gothic) shall constitute a square.

SPRING OF

HON. HENRY STANLEY,

Lancaster, Ohio, Sept. 26, 1868.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: We are on the eve of a Presidential election, a struggle for power between two contending parties—one called Republican, the other Democratic and Conservative. It is to the last named party that, as a Conservative, I belong.

You know me in years past as a Whig, in this country, during six Presidential elections. As a member of the Whig party I contended against the Democratic party. Now I am an adherent of the latter. The issue of the past has disappeared; there is no longer any question about a bank of the United States; about internal improvements by the Federal Government; about a tariff for protection; about free trade; about the question of more territory, and, above all, about fugitive slave laws and slavery in the Territories. These questions, once deemed so vital, no longer enter into the political platform of the day. They sleep with the great party leaders of former times. New questions have arisen, and with these new questions has come a new adjustment of party relations. And first were the questions that arose with the rebellion, the right of secession; the right to compel, by force, unwilling States to remain in the Union; the policy of continuing the war. These questions, too, have passed away. They were settled forever by the suppression of the rebellion.

With the close of the war, all these old questions arose, in practice, importance second only to that of the preservation of the Union—the question as to the policy to be pursued toward the Southern States. Was it to be a policy of reconciliation and restoration? or of hate and exclusion? Was it to be a policy which contemplated these States as still in the Union in their political character as States, or a policy which contemplated them as States no longer, but as so much conquered territory? While the war was in progress, the Republican party declared by resolutions of both Houses of Congress, passed with unusual unanimity, that the object of the war was not conquest, or subjugation, but the suppression of the rebellion and the restoration of the States to all their rights as States of the Union. Well, fellow-citizens, the rebellion was suppressed three years and a half ago. Has the pledge been redeemed?

It happened that when the war was about ended, Mr. Lincoln was our President and Congress was in recess. Mr. Lincoln set himself to work to carry out in good faith the pledge so made. Upon his death Mr. Johnson succeeded him, and the policy thus begun. During the summer and fall of 1865 the Southern States, acting under executive advice, repealed their ordinances of secession, and brought their constitutions and laws into conformity with Federal law, or, to use the language of Mr. Lincoln, re-established their proper relations to the Union. They chose Senators and Representatives, according to the requirements of the Federal Constitution, who presented themselves in December, 1865, and were ready to take their seats in the Thirty-ninth Congress.

They were all rejected. On what ground? Not because there was any objection to them, personally (not because they were rebels, or had ever been rebels, but because those who appeared as Senators did not represent States, and those who appeared as Representatives did not represent Congressional Districts in States. This, and this alone, was the ground of exclusion—that by the act of secession these States had lost their character as States of the Union, and so, being out of the fellowship of States, they could never be restored to their former condition, except by Congressional authority and recognition.

I am well aware that Republicans are not agreed that these Southern States were taken out of the Union by secession, or rebellion. Many, and perhaps a majority, of the Republican members of the Thirty-ninth Congress did not give their consent to that doctrine. But yet they all agreed to the exclusion of the Southern Senators and Representatives.

POSITION OF THE SOUTHERN STATES AT THE CLOSE OF THE WAR.

Now, fellow-citizens, everything turns upon that point: were these eleven States in the Union when the rebellion was suppressed? They had been States of the Union. That was their condition in 1860.

What act, what power had severed them from the Union in 1865? Certainly not Federal authority, for there is no power under our Constitution to turn a State out of the Union. There is a power to admit, but not to expel. To use the language of the Bar, there is no power of a motion in our political system.

If, then, these States were out of the Union in 1865, it must have been in virtue of their own inherent right to take themselves out. It must have been in virtue of a fundamental right, not surrendered when they became parties to the Union. It is precisely on that ground that these Republicans must stand who maintain that the ties which bound these States to the Union were dissolved; in other words, it is the doctrine of secession.

Now, consider how the other branch of the Republicans stand, who deny the doctrine, and maintain that secession was not right; that it had no color of legality, and was simply void. If this is the true doctrine, as no doubt it is—how do they justify the denial

with the plain provisions of the Constitution? I need not to but one of the provisions which declares that each State shall be entitled to two Senators—a provision deemed so sacred that it never can be changed, not even by a Constitutional amendment, without the consent of the States sought to be deprived of such representation. Again, if these States retained their character as States of the Union, the consequence is inevitable that they were States to all intents and purposes. The cardinal ideas to the States is that of equality. No State has more power than another. All have the same rights, and are subject to the same duties. When Congress declares that the State of Virginia has lost her right to representation in Congress they deny that she is a State. When Congress denies to Virginia the right to regulate the suffrage of her citizens they take from her one of the highest attributes of a State of the Union.

Between these two classes of the Republican party, that class who place the right of secession upon the ground that the States are out of the Union, show most logical consistency. If they are right in their premises, there is no way in which the other class can put their theory with even the semblance of propriety. In point of fact they are equally wrong; one is wrong in the premises, the other in the conclusion.

Secession did not take the States out of the Union; and if not, then, as States, they are entitled to representation. Let us put the question in another light. These States were in rebellion against the Federal authority. They were in actual insurrection. Such a condition of things as to States is contemplated by the Constitution, which gives to the Federal authority the right and makes it its duty to put down the insurrection, not to put down the States; to restore the former relations, not to destroy them.

I take it, therefore, to be clear that not one of these Southern States was at any time taken out of the Union. Virginia, for instance, was just as fully a State of the Union in 1865 as she was in 1860. Her ordinance of secession was a nullity and worked no change. The insurrection within her borders was an illegal act, and was lawfully put down by force of arms. Our Federal system hangs upon the position that no State can withdraw from the Union by its own volition or by unsuccessful insurrection. Once a State, always a State. You may make a State out of a Territory, but you can never make a Territory out of a State. Show me a State once in the Union, and now out of the Union, and you show me a dissolved Union—the result of secession followed by successful rebellion. No, fellow-citizens, nothing short of successful revolution can sever the ties which bind the States together. In that case arms take the place of law, and the arbitrament is final.

RECOGNITION BY CONGRESS OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE SOUTHERN STATES.

This theory that the eleven Southern States ceased to be States in virtue of their ordinance of secession is a sham—a false pretense manufactured to justify the course pursued toward them by the Republicans in Congress. If I served I could prove its falsity out of their own mouths. Let one instance suffice. The Constitution provides that a new State shall not be made out of the territory of a State without the consent of the old State. When Congress set about to make a new State out of the territory of Virginia, to be called West Virginia, what did they recite in the preamble of the act creating the new State?

They recited that the consent of the State of Virginia had been given. Mark it that this was done before the ordinance of secession of Virginia had been repealed, and before the insurrection had been put down. Even then, a Republican Congress declared in the most solemn manner that Virginia was still a State of the Union, and that she had a Legislature capable of giving assent to such an act of sovereign authority as the partition of her territory.

Look through all the legislation of Congress during the war, and in every act, and in every resolution, the eleven political communities engaged in the rebellion are everywhere recognized as States. They are uniformly declared as "States in insurrection," or "States in rebellion." Find, if you can, any act or resolution of Congress, passed during the war or since, which declares that all these States, or any one of them, ever ceased to be a State. The legislative designation given to them when the insurrection was subdued is that of "States lately in rebellion."

Nay, my friends, the Republican Congress admitted Representatives and Senators from those States to seats in each branch of the National Legislature, not as delegates from Territories, but as Representatives and Senators from States—and this while the ordinance of secession was unrepented and the rebellion was in full vigor. What, then, has peace accomplished what war could not accomplish? Is this the fruit—is this the consummation? Did our gallant and patriotic soldiers pour out their blood to destroy, and not to preserve? Did they fight to dismantle our brotherhood of States, and to strike out eleven stars from our National escutcheon? Did they struggle to accomplish what the rebellion could not accomplish? No! No! They went forth under the banner of the Constitution, to put down an insurrection, not to destroy the States in which it raged. That was a just and holy purpose, which gave the war all its dignity—all its legality. They did not leave their

pleasant homes to conquer, and abolish the States, or to subjugate the people, to acquire new territory, to build a new Union, to create new States. They went forth to restore every one of these States, and every one of their citizens, to their former relations. What they meant to do was to restore the Union, not to destroy the States, not to deprive them of representation, not to put them and their people outside of the Constitution, not to disfranchise the white race and enfranchise the black race, not to make the white man a slave and the negro a master. These white soldiers were not unfaithful to the dignity and superiority of their race. What they meant was that these eleven States should be governed by the white man, not by the negro. The Ohio soldier did not fight to give the ballot to the negro and take it from white men. He did not mean to vote negro suffrage in Ohio, and fight for it in Virginia. Not one of our soldiers went into this war to carry out the Radical idea that Congress has the right to establish negro suffrage in a State under the constitutional duty to guarantee to each State a republican government. Not one of them was so blind as not to see that if a State which denies the ballot to the negro has not a republican form of government, then Ohio is not republican, and Congress has the same right to impose negro suffrage upon Ohio as upon Virginia.

When the Rebellion was put down and peace was restored, what was required to put these revolted States in their proper relations to the Union? Nothing more than to vindicate the rights of their people. Their Constitutions, which had been changed during the rebellion to conform to their ordinances of secession, required amendment. To me nothing is clearer, than that these amendments could be made by the people of those States, whether in Congress or out of Congress. Four of these States did so at upon their own volition. The seven others were aided in the work by Executive authority, initiated by Mr. Lincoln and followed out by Mr. Johnson. This action they repealed their ordinances of secession, amended their Constitutions, and elected Senators and Representatives to represent them as States and citizens of the Union. In the Congress of the Union, that more could be asked of the Southern people? They laid down their arms; they repudiated their war debt incurred by the war; they abolished slavery. Was ever acquiescence in the result of a war more thorough and complete?

This was the state of things when a Republican Congress assembled in December, 1865; only one thing remained to finish the great work of reconstruction, and that was the admission of the Southern Representatives. They were not admitted—and wherefore not? The Constitution they had framed were not acceptable to the Radical party in one particular, and in one particular alone, and that was that they did not confer the right of suffrage on the blacks. That was the side of the matter, and in some way, right or wrong, that must be accomplished. If no way under the Constitution could be found, they intended to make a way outside the Constitution. They began, however, under the Constitution, by proposing an amendment, to be submitted to all States for adoption, and this was to change the basis of representation as fixed by the Constitution, so as to exclude the non-voting population from that basis. If the proposed amendment had contained no other provision than this, it is probable that the Southern States would have adopted it; but it was coupled with another feature, a feature unknown to all honorable Southern men, which disfranchised certain classes in the South who had engaged in the rebellion. It required these Southern people who had engaged in rebellion to degrade and punish their neighbors and friends who were no more guilty than themselves. This they would not do, and who can blame them?

MILITARY RECONSTRUCTION ACTS.

With the failure of this amendment the constitutional way was abandoned, and then at last, in the spring of 1867, the Republican Congress, called the Thirty-ninth, in the last days of its last session, found a new way outside the Constitution, and passed over the veto of the President the first of the series of acts known as the Military Reconstruction Acts. The first section declared that no legal State Government existed in ten of the Southern States, and to secure to them the blessings of a legal Government, the first step taken was to place them under a military despotism.

They were divided into five military districts. Five military commanders, with a sufficient force to compel obedience, were set over them. They were subjected to martial law, to trial by military commissions, denied the habeas corpus, the privileges of bail, the trial by jury. Out of this terrible condition, these white American citizens were left but one hope of escape, and that was to so amend their Constitutions as to disfranchise thousands of their fellow-citizens, and to grant universal suffrage to the blacks.

The provisions of the Reconstruction Acts were so cunningly arranged in fixing the qualification of voters for framing and adopting the proposed Constitutions as to secure not only black suffrage, but black supremacy. Fellow-citizens, one false step leads to others; one violation of the Constitution begets many—and so it has been in this instance. There were obstructions in carrying out these reconstruction laws. The Executive was opposed to them, and declared them unconstitutional. Straightway they set about to deprive the President of his Constitutional power. They sought

to deprive him of his constitutional power as commander-in-chief of the army, by enacting that if he sent an order to a military commander except through his subordinates, the General of the army, he should be punished by imprisonment for a term not to exceed twenty years, and be deemed guilty of an impeachable offense; and if he attempted to exercise his independent, constitutional power of removal of Federal officers, he should be punished by both fine and imprisonment, and be impeachable for a high misdemeanor; and, finally, they endeavored to remove him by impeachment, and to seize the Executive power by placing one of their most reliable, and violent partisans in his place. The other department of the Government, the Federal Judiciary, was also an obstruction. The Supreme Court had pronounced military commissions, in time of peace, unconstitutional. The Republican Congress saw that the same question would arise under their reconstruction acts—the same question did, in fact, arise, and had been taken by appeal, according to law, to that court, and was pending, argued, and ready for decision. They more than dared the decision; for they were well satisfied it would declare their legislation unconstitutional. Thereupon they repealed the law giving the Supreme Court jurisdiction over the case.

Thus, step by step, the Republican Congress arrogated to itself powers not conferred by the Constitution—usurped or frustrated the authority of the co-ordinate departments—and overthrew the barriers which defend the rights of the States.

Fellow-citizens, this was the work of the extreme Radicals of the Republican party, who led or forced the moderate men of their party into their support. And what was the purpose? To restore the Union and preserve the just rights of the States? No, fellow-citizens. It was to perpetuate the ascendancy of their party, by incorporating the black race as a political element in our system. Their purpose was to make them a part of the governing element in Federal affairs, and as far as possible the superior governing element in affairs of the South. Their purpose was to do something more than make the negro a voter. It was to make him a Republican voter, and through his agency to make every one of these States a Republican State. The true sense in which they guarantee to these States a republican government is to make them members of the Republican party.

Now, fellow-citizens, for the proof of this assertion—Read your Bible, the public legislation since the close of the war, relating to the Southern States. The Freedmen's Bureau Act, the Civil Rights Act, and the three Reconstruction Acts. If these white legislators had all been blacks, I do not see how, so far as the South is concerned, more partiality could have been shown to the blacks, or more hostility to the whites. They first insure the fealty of the blacks to their party by lavish appropriations of the public money for their education and support. They next declare that they are citizens of the United States, and give them as a political position superior to our unfortunated emigrants. They give them privileges that no Congress ever attempted to confer on the white race by constituting tribunals for their special benefit, extending over subjects wholly domestic and local, and yet independent of all State control or regulation, and, finally, when the blacks have been fully educated, and indoctrinated in the Republican faith, and are ready to vote the Republican ticket, they force negro suffrage upon the South at the point of the bayonet. When this is accomplished, Radical reconstruction has done its perfect work; and these Southern States are declared entitled to representation in Congress by showing a Republican ticket of indisputable authority at the polls.

In this way seven of the Southern States have been reconstructed, and others, as they claim, will soon follow. What next? Peace is to follow. "Let us have peace," says General Grant. He means peace accomplished by Republican reconstruction. No other peace.

Fellow-citizens, we shall never have peace or the blessings of peace through that agency. Radical reconstruction bears no such fruits. As well expect to gather grapes from thorns. Look at Tennessee, which has been reconstructed upon the Radical basis of negro suffrage and white disfranchisement for more than two years. Look at that State and tell me whether peace signs there.

When the rebellion was put down the highest order of statesmanship was required to re-adjust our political system. Wisdom and calm deliberation were required. It was no party work that was to be done. Now what have we seen? Everything done in the interests of the Republican party, and not of the nation. Laws passed in violation of the Constitution, under the dictation of a caucus and the lash of a party leader, to secure party supremacy and to amend their Constitution as to disfranchise thousands of their fellow-citizens, and to grant universal suffrage to the blacks.

Fellow-citizens, I have made up my mind to oppose these revolutionary measures, and as such opposition can only be carried out by concerted action and organization, I find myself side by side with my old political antagonists. Whenever, in our political contests, I find one party systematically engaged in violating our Constitution, and another battling for its preservation, I have no doubt, no hesitation as to my policy. When it comes to that, former political ties and associations do not draw me. They are as ropes of sand.

Our previous Constitution is my standard of political faith and political action. Show me a party which carries out its measures regardless of

the sacred provisions of the Constitution, or in the language of its leader, "outside of the Constitution," and I will shun its companionship, though all my former political associates were in its ranks. Show me a party faithful to the Constitution, and in its ranks, though composed exclusively of former political antagonists, my place and position will be found. Measures not meet? It is the rule for me. It is the present and the future, not the past, that decides the matter. I do not ask my Democratic brother, who now fights by my side in the cause of the Constitution, whether in former contests, and upon issues which have passed away, we were agreed. The prime wisdom lies in the living issues of to-day. The question with me is not whether a party was wrong once, but whether it is right now.

And now, my friends, I have given you the main reasons why I stand here to-day—yes, here in my old country, where, for a quarter of a century I stood opposed to the Democracy—here, in the midst of old political associates and well-beloved friends, why I stand here upon a Democratic platform. I stand here to support the Constitution, to support the first rights of the States, to sustain civil law and civil government against martial law and military rule, to defend the all essential rights of American citizens, to preserve the guarantees which make us a free people, to defend the habeas corpus, the trial by jury, the right of the white people of the States to frame their own Constitutions for themselves. I stand here to defend the sacred rights of the States, of Virginia against the imposition of negro suffrage upon her, unwilling white people, as I would stand here to defend the white people of Ohio from a similar outrage.

THE NEGRO OUTRAGE.

Hitherto, fellow-citizens, I have put the case upon constitutional grounds. I have arraigned the measures and the policy of the Republican party as subversive of our fundamental law. Now let us look at their measures and their policy from another point of view. If not, constitutional, are they, at least, wise and right in themselves? Is universal negro suffrage a good thing in itself—so good that it must be established *per fas et contra*, by right or wrong? Is it so supreme a right that to deny it is anti-republican? People of Ohio, of all political parties, I need not wait for your answer.

You say I last fall in tones of thunder. You then said this is a white man's government, and you rejected this good thing with loathing and abhorrence. Mark it, my friends, that the question put to the people of Ohio was negro suffrage alone. What would have been your answer if the thing proposed was to give the ballot to the negro with one hand, and take it from the white man with the other? What would you have said if the proposition made to you was intended, not to make negro suffrage a harmless element in the regulation of your political affairs, as it would be in Ohio, but to make it the controlling element? Look at the reconstructed State of South Carolina, and what do you see? All its white people subjected to the domination of the black race. There are those who say: "This is well; this is retributive justice; this is the legitimate fruit of unsuccessful rebellion; this is security for the future; this is the restoration promised; this is peace."

Fellow-citizens, it is neither restoration nor peace. It portends a conflict. There is no security in it either for the black race or the white, and least of all for the blacks. All history teaches us that where these two races of men exist together the white race must rule. No human laws can work out the problem of their social equality or political equality; but human laws may place them in hostility to each other; human laws may array one race against the other, and place the negro on a level with, or above the white man, but nothing short of the bayonet can keep him there.

When the eleven Southern States attempted to secede from the Union, when the eight millions of their white people, with such remarkable unanimity, took that fatal step, it was under the idea that they were exercising a constitutional right. They had been educated in that faith. We, of the North, had been taught in another school. We were not to be affected by the errors of the South. We were to be guided by the foundation of our Government. It was one of those political questions which nothing but arms could decide, and which, at last, arms did decide.

Now, my friends, one and all, I put this question to you, especially to such of you as maintain that these Southern people are the greatest of criminals and deserve no mercy: I ask you to put your hands on your hearts and tell me whether, if you had been born under a Southern sun, and had lived all your lives in a Southern State, and had been taught from your infancy that secession was a constitutional right, if you would not have gone with your people into secession? Do not misunderstand me. As a Northern man, taught by Webster and Clay, not by Calhoun or Davis, I denied the right of secession, and while the war raged I was in favor of fighting it out for the preservation of the Union. While these Southern people had arms in their hands I looked upon them as public enemies; but when the rebellion was put down—when these misguided people gave up the contest, and with it gave up all the issues of the contest—then to me it seemed the part of wisdom to receive them back into the fold. That was Mr. Lincoln's policy—that has been Mr. Johnson's, and under its influence conquered twice; first, by our arms, and next by our clemency; they did

all that men could do to repair and make amends for the past.

Fellow-citizens, you know what followed. You know how they have been treated, and in what spirit a Republican Congress met their overtures of friendship and reconciliation. They asked for bread and were given a stone. Their Constitutions, framed upon our constitutional model, and according to all its requirements, were declared illegal, and in the name of legitimacy they were put under a military despotism, only to be superseded by negro domination.

Do you wonder that at this moment there is no true peace in the South? Do you know so little of human nature, and especially of human nature in its American type, as to delude yourselves with the idea that this was the right way? Could you expect any other results than those which have followed? Are you surprised to hear that in the reconstructed States there are collisions between the two races, and calls for more arms and more money, especially in that State which has been longest reconstructed? Make the Freedmen's Bureau a permanent establishment, turn the whole South into a military camp, increase your army and establish a military post in every precinct of the South, and you may have peace, but it will be the peace of despotism.

When General Grant accepts the nomination and the platform of the Republican party, he stands pledged to carry out their policy. When he says "let us have peace," he means the sort of peace which the triumph of Republican Reconstruction is to effect. He pledges himself to stand by negro suffrage imposed upon the South by the Republican party, and to fight it out on that line. I have nothing to say against General Grant as a soldier. He was educated as a soldier, and has shown great capacity as a military man. He has been honored by a grateful people, and those honors were fairly won and well deserved. But when he enters the arena of politics, and accepts the leadership of a party, I must look to the party, and not its standard-bearer—to the measures of the party, and not the man.

Fellow-citizens, there is a class of persons who admit that Republican reconstruction is all unconstitutional, who desire to see it reformed, but do not see how it can be done. They have an indefinable dread of the Democratic party, and fear to trust it with your power. Why, my friends, this same Democratic party has governed the Republic more than three-fourths of the period of our existence as a nation. When, in all its history, was it guilty of such infractions of the Constitution as this Republican party has committed during the short term of its existence? Need I answer the infamous charge, made by leading Republicans, that this old party is made up of rebels and rebel sympathizers, that it brought on the war and left the Republican party to fight it out? Grant was a Democrat and so was Sherman, and of the rank and file of our armies how many Democrats gave their lives for the nation's might, and how many still survive true to their old Democratic faith!

THE REMEDY.

And now as to the question, how can the Democratic-Conservative party apply a remedy? There are some who say that the evil is incurable; that right or wrong the black race of the South have been invested with the right of suffrage, and it cannot be taken from them—that right or wrong the Southern States have been reconstructed and recognized by Congress, and in virtue of that recognition their status is irrevocably fixed. Listen a moment, my doubting friends. If a Republican Congress could disfranchise the white men, cannot a Democratic Congress disfranchise the negro? If a Republican Congress can take the ballot from the white man and give it to the negro, cannot a Democratic Congress restore it to its rightful owner? If a Republican Congress could declare a State Constitution void when made by the white men of a State in the exercise of their free will, cannot a Democratic Congress declare a State Constitution void made by the black men of a State with the help of the bayonet?

Finally, if a Congressional recognition is the test of State legality, cannot a Democratic Congress apply just as well as a Republican Congress? All we have to do is reverse what has been done, and undo by constitutional means what has been done by revolutionary means. First of all elect a President who will fight it out on the Constitution. Instead of the line of Republicanism. Next, elect a Democratic House of Representatives. Half the work is then done, for not a Representative from any one of these reconstructed States will be recognized or allowed to take his seat in that body, and not an other dollar will be appropriated to sustain the Freedmen's Bureau or the military occupation of the South.

Finally, put a Democratic majority in the Senate and then the good work will be finished. It will take time, perhaps more time to correct all this mischief than it has taken to commit it. The process may be a slow one, but my Democratic friends, if you are of the same class of men as I am—if you possess the same steadfast and unconquerable will—sooner or later success is sure. Then the primal glories of the Republic will come back; then the lost will be found.

Then these Southern people, purified by a great moral reform, released forever from slavery and its attendant evils, conquered more effectually by our elements than by our arms, will stand again once more by the old flag. Then, indeed, the star of peace will return. No more domestic strife—no more rebellion. Then no more shall

the Northern and Southern soldier confront each other in opposing ranks, but shoulder to shoulder, in an unconquerable column, where the fiery valor of the Southern shall be united with the heroic courage of the Northern soldier, they may defy the world in arms.

OBITUARY.

Brevet Brigadier General William Gates, U. S. A., died in New York City on the 24th day of October, at the advanced age of eighty years. He graduated at West Point in 1806, and served in the war of 1812, in the Florida wars from 1836 to 1841, and in the Mexican war from 1846 to 1848. He captured the famous Seminole, Osceola. In 1853, while moving troops to California, he was wrecked on the steamer San Francisco. On March 13, 1865, he was created Brevet Brigadier General for long and faithful services. He was in the army for sixty-seven years, and during that long period was never reported as on the sick list.

Brevet Brigadier General Adam J. Slemmer, U. S. A., died of heart disease on October 8th, at Fort Laramie. He graduated at West Point in 1850, and served in the Seminole war of 1850, on frontier duty in California, and in the war of the rebellion. He was in command of Fort Barnum, when, on January 10th, 1861, he transferred his forces to Fort Pickens, in defense of which he remained till May 9th, 1861, being in command till the 14th of April, 1861. Subsequently he was engaged in the siege of Corinth, the movement to Louisville, relief of Nashville, and battle of Stone River. In the latter action he was severely wounded, and during the remainder of the rebellion was employed on board duty and in command of garrisons. On March 13th, 1865, he was appointed Brevet Brigadier General for gallant and meritorious services. General Slemmer was a native of Montgomery county, Pennsylvania.

Howell Cobb, of Georgia, whose death occurred on the 9th inst., in New York, was born in Jefferson county, Georgia, in 1815. He graduated at Franklin College, in 1834, and studying law, was admitted to practice two years afterwards. After serving in several State offices, he was chosen to Congress in 1843, in which he served until 1850, being elected Speaker in 1849. In 1850, he was elected Governor of Georgia, by the Democrats, and in 1855 was re-elected to Congress. In 1857, President Buchanan made him Secretary of the Treasury, which he resigned near the close of 1860. He espoused the cause of the rebellion and served both in the Confederate Congress and the army. Since the war he has held no political office. Mr. Cobb was a man of decided abilities, and has wielded great influence in his native State and section.

We have all read the history of the husband who, in a moment of hasty wrath, said to his wife who had a few moments before uttered a word to his effect, "If you are not satisfied with me, go back, go back, return to your friends and to your happiness." "And will you give me back that which I brought to you?" asked the despairing wife. "Yes," he replied, "all your wealth shall go with you; I covet it not." "Alas," she answered, "I thought not of my wealth—I spoke of my devoted love; can you give that back to me?" "No!" said the man, as he flung himself at her feet. "No! I cannot restore these, but I will do more—I will keep them unsullied and unstained—I will cherish them through my life, and in my death; and never again will I forget that I have sworn to protect a thing of mine more precious to me than all she held most dear. Did I not tell you that there was poetry in a woman's look—a woman's word? See it here! the mild, the gentle reproach of love, winning back from its harshness and rudeness the stern and unyielding temper of an angry man. Ah! if creation's fairer sex only knew their strongest weapons, how many of wedlock's fiercest battles would be unfought; how much of unhappiness and coldness would be avoided!

THE WILL AND THE WAY.—I learned grammar when I was a private soldier, on the pay of sixpence a day. The region of my berth, or that of my guard-bed, was my seat to study in; my knapsack, my book-case, and a bit of board lying on my lap was my writing-table. I had no money to purchase a candle or oil; in winter, it was rarely that I could get any light but that of the fire, and only my turn even of that. To buy a pen or piece of paper, I was compelled to forego some portion of my food, though, in a state of half starvation, I had not a moment of time that I could care for my own; and I had to read and write, amid the talking, laughing, singing, whistling and howling of at least half a score of the most thoughtless men—and that, too, in their hours of freedom from all control. And I say, if I, under these circumstances, could encounter and overcome the task, is there, can there be, in the whole world, a youth who can find an excuse for the non-performance?—*Cobbett.*

REPORTS FROM BATES COUNTY, MO., represent that the Registrars are overawed by a Radical mob, who have robbed and beaten Democrats at the door of the Registration Office because they would not burrah for negro suffrage. They also assert their determination to carry the county, even if they have to use force at the polls. On Monday last every Democratic office in Bates county was placed under guard, and kept a prisoner for more than six hours. Under the influence of the Deputy Sheriff, they were finally released, and the armed mob dispersed.—*Nashville Banner.*

MR. BULLOCK, of Bristol, R. I., aged 68 years, was lately saved from death by a pet cat, who saw the bed taken fire, and comprehending the urgency of the case, broke a pane in the window, jumped out, ran round to another window, broke a pane there and ran in, awoke another family, and tore at the bed clothes until he got up and discovered the danger of his aged relative.

A HINT TO PURCHASERS.—The best is the cheapest.

Per year, in advance.	\$5.00
If not paid in advance.	6.00
Six months, in advance.	3.00
Three months, in advance.	1.50

Advertisements in Special Notice Column, or in double column, or rate and space, will be charged at any rate, additional.

THE SILENT ARGUMENT.

There is one mode of reaching the popular heart that will have the effect in every community; that is the silent reflection of the people; every household can see the changed condition of our once happy country. The New York Express has well said that everywhere, on every side, in every home and household is a Democratic argument—such as "the double price of tea; the triple price of sugar; the double price of clothing; the velocity and volume with which property in almost every part of the country is running from the poor to the rich in consequence of the inequality and injustice of taxation; the destruction of our foreign commercial marine; the enrichment of all gold and silver as coins, and the universal fall of paper; the downfall of the Constitution everywhere; the substitution of a consolidated for a federal form of government; the overthrow of the right of jury trial and of the habeas corpus among millions of our people; the subjugation of eight millions of white men in the South to three or four millions of negroes; the reign of carpet-baggers in Congress (generally runaways from the North), assuming to represent the whites and negroes in the South."

All these are Democratic arguments in every man's mouth, and are present more or less everywhere, in every house, cottage and cabin.

Uncle Ben was a queer old man, a queer old man was he; he owned a ram, a butting ram—in fact, his butting propensities prompted him to butt everything he could see. Uncle Ben had a fat old spouse, a fat old wife was she, who used to feed and pall his horse that came so regularly into the lawn every night, and stopped under a large pear-tree. This fat old wife never used a stool to milk, would never sit down; and though old Ben called her a fool, yet she would never leave him to his advice; but to reciprocate the favor, she said he was a big clown. But one sad morning, as Brindle stood beneath the stately pear, old Ben's wife, in a merry mood, was milking her, occupying her usual position—a little elevated in the air. The Ram and Ben the fat espied, and loudly Ben did shout, "Squat down! squat down!" she sternly cried. But she did not hear him, and before he could interfere, the ram had turned his fat old wife inside out. Now, Uncle Ben was very wrath, ah! very wrath was he; he took the grindstone from its trough, and tying a rope to it, hung it upon a limb of the old pear-tree. There, like a heavy pendulum, he swung that mighty rock, which seemed to say, "I'm up to fun, Mr. Ram, so just 'come in' and take an affectionate knock." Right briskly, then, the fight began; the stone would not give in, and Ben's old ram would yield to none; so he butted at day, and when Uncle Ben went to bed, he was butting like all sin. But when old Ben arose next day, and went into the lawn, the ram had bucked himself away, and everything under heavens, but about two inches of his tail, was left up—completely gone.

THE LESSON OF THE PAST.—When we reflect, says the Sun, that eighteen centuries have rolled past since a voice from heaven taught man the doctrine of peace and good will on earth, and that scarcely yet has any portion of the Old World reduced to practice the fundamental doctrine of the christianity which nearly every nation professes, we feel as if